

THE AIMS AND METHODS OF THE "A. P. A."

BY W. J. H. TRAYNOR, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE
ASSOCIATION.

IF THE American Protective Association owed an apology for its existence either to the people of the United States or to humanity at large, I for one should not be among its apologists, nor should I at this moment occupy valuable space, and to me and those I serve much more valuable time, in a condensed exposition—not defence—of its principles, and the conditions which have brought about its existence, in reply to Mr. Lathrop's article entitled "Hostility to Roman Catholics," which appeared in the May number of this REVIEW.

By way of preface, I wish to state that, denying as I do the catholicity of the Papal church and the pretensions of the See at Rome, it would be inconsistent in me to use the term "Roman Catholic" or "Catholic." Therefore in substituting "Papist" and "Papacy," I but wish to be understood as alluding to that ecclesiastical government of which the Pope is the head and to the followers thereof—not in any sense with a desire to be discourteous or derisive.

Mr. Lathrop has asked: "Why should not Catholics enjoy equal freedom, as citizens, to hold opinions on morals or education, to engage in politics or government, to advance them?" The question is a pertinent one, and the reply hinges upon the definition of the term "Catholic"—the prefix "Roman" being conceded. Webster defines a (Roman) Catholic as "an adherent of the Church of Rome." We have now to determine by evidence whether the assumptions of the Papal church are consistent with good citizenship.

There is no obscurity in the position taken by the United

States in the matter of allegiance ; the State requires most perfect and complete fidelity and obedience to the Republic. The voice of the Papacy is no less uncertain ; it demands the unqualified obedience of its adherents to the Pontiff. Thus Cardinal Manning, speaking in the name of the Pope, has said :

"I acknowledge no civil power ; I am the subject of no civil power ; I am the subject of no prince, and I claim to be more than this. I claim to be the supreme judge and director of the consciences of men, of the peasants that till the fields, and of the prince that sits upon the throne ; of the household that sits in the shade of privacy, and the legislature that makes laws for kingdoms. I am sole, last, supreme judge of what is right and wrong. Moreover, we declare, affirm, define, and pronounce it to be necessary to salvation to every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff."

All of which may be found in Quirinus (Appendix I., p. 832) and the *Tablet* of October 9, 1864.

I now quote from Manning's *Decrees and Civil Allegiance*, p. 54, where the Cardinal says :

"It is clear that the civil power cannot define how far the circumference of faith and morals extends. . . . If the church cannot fix the limits of its jurisdiction, then either nobody can or the state must. But the state cannot unless it claim to be the depository and expositor of the Christian revelation. Therefore it is the church or nobody. This last supposition leads to chaos. Now if this be rejected, the church alone can ; and if the church can fix the limits of its jurisdiction, *it can fix the limits of all other jurisdictions.*"

The same authority, in *Cæsarism and Ultramontanism*, p. 36, argues :

"Any power which is independent and can alone fix the limits of its own jurisdiction, and can thereby fix the limit of all other jurisdictions, is, *ipso facto*, supreme."

The following from an address delivered by Pope Pius IX., of infallibility fame, July 21, 1873, is pertinent :

"There are many errors regarding infallibility ; but the most malicious of all is that which includes, in that dogma, the right of deposing sovereigns, and declaring the people no longer bound by the obligation of fidelity. This RIGHT has now and again in critical circumstances been exercised by the pontiffs . . . its origin was not the infallibility, but the AUTHORITY of the Pope."

It is denied by many that the Papacy demands the temporal allegiance of Papists. Let me quote the following from an Encyclical of Leo XIII., November, 1885 :

"We exhort all Catholics to devote careful attention to public matters, and take part in all municipal affairs and elections, and all public services, meetings, and gatherings. All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in countries where they live. All

Catholics should exert their power to cause the constitutions of states to be modelled on the principles of the true church."

The Revised Statutes of the United States declare :

"The alien seeking citizenship must make oath to renounce forever all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty, in particular that to which he has been subject."

The obligation of the oath of allegiance to the United States, from the point of view of a Papist, may be measured by the following :

"No oaths are to be kept if they are against the interests of the Church of Rome."—*Corpus Juris Canonici*, Leipsic ed., 1839, p. 1159.

Again :

"Oaths which are against the Church of Rome are not to be called oaths, but perjuries."—*Ibid*, p. 358.

Again, Pius IX. asserted to himself the right to annul the constitutions and laws of certain countries, viz., New Grenada, in 1852; of Mexico, in 1856; of Spain, in 1855, and of Austria in 1868. See *Acerbissimum*, Sept. 27, 1852; *Nunquam Fore*, Dec. 15, 1856; *Nemo Vestrum*, July 24, 1855; *Allocutio Nunquam Certe*, June 22, 1868.

The foregoing, it will be seen, are authorities of comparatively modern date. One authority even more recent deserves insertion here, under the head of civil allegiance—

"We command all whom it concerns to recognize in you (Francisco Satolli) as apostolic delegate, the supreme power of the delegating pontiff; we command that they give you aid, concurrence, and obedience in all things, that they receive with reverence your salutary admonitions and orders. Whatever sentence or penalty you shall duly declare or inflict against those who oppose our authority, we will ratify, and, with the authority given us by the Lord, will cause to be observed inviolably until condign satisfaction be made." "*Notwithstanding constitutions and apostolic ordinance or other to the contrary.*"—Extract from encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. to the Papal clergy in the United States, January 24, 1892.

Thus we see that the Papal hierarchy declares its complete sovereignty over the state, and, in utter disregard of the constitution and the laws of the land, decrees that the Papal fiat is superior to the voice of the people; and that the Papists of the United States yield acquiescence and obedience to this assumption of authority is shown in the following :

"We glory that we are, and, with God's blessing, shall continue to be, not the American church, nor the church in the United States, nor a church in any other sense, exclusive or limited, but an integral part of the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ."—*Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii*, p. LXXVI. (Baltimore, 1886.)

"Nor are there in the world more devoted adherents of the Catholic Church, the See of Peter, and the Vicar of Christ than the Catholics of the United States."—*Ibid.*

The position taken by the Papacy regarding matters of state, as illustrated by the authorities quoted, and a hundred others equally as pertinent, form the fundamental reasons for the existence of the American Protective Association, although it is doubtful whether, if these conditions had existed as a theory only, the organization would ever have been anything more than a mere name. It was the active and aggressive application of the temporal claims of the Papacy by its subjects in this country that made the perfection of the "A. P. A." not only possible, but an actual necessity, our legislators, for the greater part, being either unwilling or too corrupt to deal with an issue in which their personal interests had become inextricably involved.

Mr. Lathrop makes an unfortunate reference to "ballot or bullet." This expression has been used, so far as I have been able to learn, exclusively by members of the Papal church; notably by Monsignor Capel, who threatened with "bullets" the school-tax collector; and by the Jesuit Sherman, who, from the public platform in Chicago, less than six months since, advocated the use of "free bullets" in preference to free speech.

Opinions among Romanists may differ as to who seeks to "trail 'Old Glory' in the dust"—he who hauls it down upon St. Patrick's or any other day to replace it with the emblem of another nation or race, as so frequently done in New York and other large cities, or he who declares that it shall be all-sufficient for those who live upon American soil. To the members of the American Protective Association there can be no question of its all-sufficiency. We have had many instances of priests of the Papacy refusing to admit to their churches and cemeteries deceased members of the G. A. R. until the "stars and stripes" had been removed from the coffin.

"Arms in Catholic churches" or rumors thereof, is a matter that needs neither confirmation nor refutation. It is sufficient that Papist societies, from which non-Papists are religiously excluded, armed with rifles and bayonets, may be seen upon the public streets at any important Roman Catholic celebration. Why these armed companies exist or whether they store their arms in churches, convents, or lodgerooms and armories, are

matters which come within Mr. Lathrop's province to determine; it is enough for me that both men and arms are actual and visible auxiliaries to the Papal church.

Parenthetically the following item from the New York *World* of April 27, dated from San Jose, Costa Rica, April 26, is significant :

"Relations between the government and the church party are strained, owing to discoveries of arms stored in convents."

I have yet to learn that General Sheridan was as "good" a Papist as Mr. Lathrop would make him appear. If the brave general was a "good Catholic" he believed in the temporal power of the Pope; if he did not so believe, he was a Papist only in name. It is as much a heresy to deny a dogma of the Papal church as to deny the church itself.

Mr. Lathrop refers generally to those "colonial families" who were members of the Papal church, and particularly to his own pedigree, ranging over two hundred and sixty years; yet he neglects to inform the readers of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW that nearly all—if not all—of these ancestors of whom he is justly proud were not Papists in any sense of the word, and among the signatures upon the Declaration of Independence I fail to discover one *bona-fide* Roman Catholic. Carroll, of Carrollton, was the nearest approach to a Papist, yet he was evidently a most indifferent one, and the last to sign the Declaration.

Mr. Lathrop says :

"We (Roman Catholics) are bound to obey the laws of the state when they are not contrary to the law of God."

Very clearly put; and as Cardinal Manning asserts that "it (the Church) can fix the limits of all other jurisdictions" besides its own, the reason is easily discoverable why Papists oppose the public school, and, in defiance of the Constitution, demand public money to support sectarian institutions, and why, also in defiance of the Constitution, it has for many years past used the garb of sanctity as a means whereby to absorb the political offices of the country, as in New York, Chicago, St. Louis, New Orleans, San Francisco, and all other important cities of the United States, wherein from 60 to 95 per cent. of the public officials are papists.

"Neither the church nor its American members are trying to break down the public-school system," Mr. Lathrop asserts, but here again I prefer the authority of Pius IX., who denounced the

public schools as "godless" and threatened with anathema all who dared to send their children thereto. I would also refer Mr. Lathrop to the decrees of the Councils of Baltimore upon this matter.

Mr. Lathrop is undoubtedly a "good Catholic," for he quotes St. Thomas Aquinas as an authority upon "what constitutes cause for revolution by the people." The reference is most happy; and before returning St. Thomas to the shelf I take occasion to refer to Vol. 4, p. 90, where I find the following:

"Though heretics (*i. e.*, all who are not 'good catholics') must not be tolerated because they deserve it, we must bear with them, till, by a second admonition, they may be brought back to the faith of the church. But those who, after a second admonition, remain obstinate in their errors, must not only be excommunicated, but they must be delivered over to the secular power to be exterminated."

In passing let me call attention to an extract from another Papal authority—this time a decree passed by the council of Lateran in 1215, and declared by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Foley, of Chicago, under oath on Dec. 30, 1870, before the Circuit Court of Kankakee, Ill., to be a law of the Papal church to-day:

"We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy that rears its head against the holy orthodox or catholic faith, condemning all heretics, by whatever name they may be known, for though their faces differ, they are tied together by their tails. Such as are condemned are to be delivered over to the secular powers for punishment. If laymen, their goods must be confiscated. . . . Secular powers of all ranks and degrees are to be warned, induced, and, if necessary, compelled by ecclesiastical censure, to swear that they will exert themselves to the utmost in the defence of the faith, and extirpate all heresies denounced by the church," etc.

In the whole range of history was ever a stronger argument than this submitted as a reason for the existence of an organization for the conservation of American liberty?

The assumption of the Papacy to control in politics was illustrated most fully during the recent debate upon the civil-marriage bill in Hungary. The moment the state claimed the right to legalize civil marriage, the church created almost a revolution to defeat the claim, acting upon the self-asserted right of *defining its own jurisdiction*. Even so with our public schools; the state declares that they shall be non-sectarian, yet in defiance of the state the church sends its nuns and priests into the public schools of Pennsylvania and elsewhere to teach Papal dogmas.

The Constitution declares that no appropriation shall be made

for sectarian purposes; the church, *defining its own jurisdiction*, demands a portion of the public money for the support of Romish parochial schools. The State declares the right of free speech; the Church permits its subjects to reject this principle, and they attack and attempt to murder public lecturers at Lafayette, Ind.; Kansas City, St. Louis, and scores of other places.

Closely allied to the principle that underlies the liberty of conscience is *freedom of speech and of the press*.

The First amendment to the Constitution reads:

"Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or the press."

Yet, in the light of this, Leo XIII., in a letter, June 17, 1885, says:

"Such a duty (obedience), while incumbent upon all without exception, *is most strictly so on journalists* who, if they were not animated with the *spirit of docility and submission* so necessary to every Catholic, would help to extend and greatly aggravate the evils we deplore."

A writer of the *Catholic World*, in an article published July, 1870, entitled "The Catholics of the Nineteenth Century," explains the position of the Papists on the question of free speech and of free press. He says:

"The supremacy asserted for the Church in matters of education implies the additional and cognate function of the censorship of ideas, and the right to examine and approve or disapprove all books, publications, writing, and utterances intended for public instruction, enlightenment, or entertainment, and supervision of places of amusement. This is the principle upon which the Church has acted in holding over to the civil authorities for punishment criminals in the world of ideas."

Yes, Galileo was a splendid example of the Papal "censorship of ideas." Wycliff, Huss, Bruno, and many thousand victims of the Spanish Inquisition are a few other early instances; and the attempted assassination of public speakers within a few months in the United States may be taken as illustrating the later days of Rome's censorship, leaving no room for doubt (in the human mind) that the Papal boast, *Semper eadem*, is quite true.

In marked contrast is the behavior of members of the "A. P. A." when the defenders of Rome have attacked them either in public or private. There is yet an instance to be cited of a blow struck or a shot fired to avenge either an insult to Protestantism or the order. That cause is a poor one which needs force to defend it against moral argument. It is strange, too, that where

the voice of civil authority has been raised in vain against riot and bloodshed the priests have been able to restore peace with a few words ; notably in the cities just named. It serves to emphasize what the "A. P. A." and Papacy alike have always claimed that the Papist places the church above the state, and canon law above civil law ; such divided allegiance is impeachable in the light of the American Constitution.

Permit the Papacy to carry out its aggressive policy, as defined in its canons and decrees, and its methods such as have been pursued in the United States for many years past, and what would become of our boasted constitutional prerogative of free speech and free press ?

The minor issues raised by Mr. Lathrop may be disposed of in a few lines. First :

The American Mechanics do *not* admit any one to their order who is not American by nativity. Again, why should they not "wear swords at church"—even as the Knights of St. John and other Papist societies wear them ? Why should they not exclude Papists from their order, with the example—half a century old—set them of the Papal orders excluding non-Papists from *their* military, semi-military, and "benefit organizations" ?

The American Protective Association has not, nor ever had, any "organ." In my address to the Supreme Council in May last I for the first time advocated the establishing of one.

The assertion that the A. P. A. has urged commercial proscription of Papists, either directly or indirectly, is absolutely incorrect. On the contrary, it has constantly set its face against such an un-American measure. As a matter of fact, the "secrecy" of the order against which Mr. Lathrop inveighs so bitterly is entirely due to the fact that members of the "A. P. A.," when suspected or known to be such, have been so mercilessly boycotted as to drive them out of business, and not unfrequently out of the towns and cities in which they lived.

In regard to the alleged purchase of arms by the "A. P. A." of Toledo, Ohio, the report, like the assertion, is false *in toto*. A clause in the constitution of the order prohibits any but legal political measures on the part of its membership. A military body organizing under the charter of the order would subject the members thereof to expulsion.

The organization does not recognize its members as "Protest-

ants" from a religious point of view, but only by reason of the fact that they *protest* against ecclesiasticism and corruption in the affairs of state. Comprising in its membership, as it does, Jews, theosophists, deists, spiritualists, free-thinkers, adventists, and other believers in Deity, it cannot be considered as "Protestant" from a religious standpoint.

Regarding the matter of so-called "A. P. A. riots," Mr. Lathrop is just as lamentably ignorant as upon other matters connected with the organization. In the case cited, the press of Kansas City stated that the mob set upon and endeavored to murder the lecturer, that he had to fly for his life, etc. In the Columbus matter Mr. Lathrop is equally at sea. The facts are that a young girl *was* detained at a monastic institution against her will, and was released by due legal process, for the details of which I refer Mr. Lathrop to the Columbus court records.

Mr. Lathrop, while evincing the most unmistakable and inexcusable ignorance regarding the "A. P. A.," has had the extremely bad taste to denounce it as "ignorant and stupidly malicious." Hard words neither break bones nor strengthen a weak cause in the eyes of the intelligent, and, moreover, the organization referred to does not consider an amendment to the Constitution necessary to prohibit sectarian appropriations; for the reason that the Constitution has fully declared itself upon this point.

I would suggest that Mr. Lathrop consult the fundamental principles of the Union as diligently as he has the interests of the Papacy. Another glance at the Constitution should convince him that denominational control of public schools is unlawful.

"If religion itself or the political rights of Catholics be threatened, the Pope may advise defensive action, either by abstention from voting or by the formation of a party, etc." So quotes Mr. Lathrop, yet he denounces the "A. P. A." and kindred societies when they assert that Romanism is political as well as ecclesiastical. Where in the Constitution does Mr. Lathrop find provision made whereby a foreign priest may define the rights and duties of American citizens?

The schools of Switzerland are referred to. Mr. Lathrop is all abroad; this is neither Switzerland nor the Vatican, but the United States—a fact which seems to have been overlooked by him.

Are there not bishops and cardinals in the Papal church who

can speak for the Papacy? Is it that the Papal authorities are as afraid to place themselves upon record as our legislators seem to be? I might well be excused from replying to Mr. Lathrop, for he officially represents no one's opinions but his own, while I have the honor to represent those of more than two millions of my fellow-citizens.

I trust that whosoever hereafter undertakes to defend the Papacy and impeach the "A. P. A." and kindred associations will be a person of some authority in the Papal church, whose utterances may be placed upon record to stand for all time. Meantime the "A. P. A." continues to grow and thrives amazingly, including in its ranks scholars and statesmen of the first magnitude, who, comparing the canon law of the Papacy with the Constitution, have come to the conclusion—Mr. Lathrop notwithstanding—that he who professes to be a citizen of the United States and a subject of Rome is an anomaly dangerous alike to the Republic and the Papacy.

W. J. H. TRAYNOR.